

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 34344

STATE OF IDAHO,)	2008 Unpublished Opinion No. 469
)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	Filed: May 16, 2008
)	
v.)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)	
COLE CONRAD KARNS,)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Seventh Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bonneville County. Hon. Richard T. St. Clair, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent unified sentences of four years, with two years determinate, for grand theft, and five years with two years determinate, for two counts of forgery, affirmed; order denying I.C.R. 35 motion for reduction of sentence, affirmed.

Molly J. Huskey, State Appellate Public Defender; Jason C. Pintler, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Lori A. Fleming, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

PER CURIAM

Cole Conrad Karns was charged with one count of grand theft, I.C. §§ 18-2403, 18-2407(1)(b)8, and with two counts of forgery, I.C. § 18-3601, and was found guilty by a jury on all counts. The district court sentenced Karns to four years, with two years determinate, for the grand theft charge and to five years, with two years determinate, for each of the forgery charges, with the sentences ordered to run concurrently. Karns filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion for reduction of sentences, which the district court denied. Karns appeals, contending that the district court abused its discretion by imposing excessive sentences and by denying his Rule 35 motion.

Where a sentence is within the statutory limits, it will not be disturbed on appeal absent an abuse of the sentencing court's discretion. *State v. Hedger*, 115 Idaho 598, 604, 768 P.2d

1331, 1337 (1989). We will not conclude on review that the sentencing court abused its discretion unless the sentence is unreasonable under the facts of the case. *State v. Brown*, 121 Idaho 385, 393, 825 P.2d 482, 490 (1992). In evaluating the reasonableness of a sentence, we consider the nature of the offense and the character of the offender, applying our well-established standards of review. See *State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 170 P.3d 387 (2007).

A Rule 35 motion is a request for leniency which is addressed to the sound discretion of the sentencing court. *State v. Knighton*, 143 Idaho 318, 319, 144 P.3d 23, 24 (2006); *State v. Allbee*, 115 Idaho 845, 846, 771 P.2d 66, 67 (Ct. App. 1989). In presenting a Rule 35 motion, the defendant must show that the sentence is excessive in light of new or additional information subsequently provided to the district court in support of the motion. *State v. Huffman*, 144 Idaho 201, 203, 159 P.3d 838, 840 (2007).

Applying the foregoing standards and having reviewed the record, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion by imposing Karn's sentence and by denying his Rule 35 motion for reduction of sentence. Accordingly, Karn's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed, as is the denial of his Rule 35 motion.